

REMARKS

1. Applicant acknowledges that claims 9 and 10 have been withdrawn from consideration.
2. In paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action the Abstract was objected to. Applicant has amended the Abstract, taking into account the comments and statements made in the Office Action. It is believed that the objections have been overcome.
3. Also in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, without comment regarding its relevancy, an outline of the ideal Specification is set forth. Applicant has made some amendments to the Specification, and believes that all requirements have been met.
4. The disclosure was objected to for failing to describe the "sensing device", the "control device", etc. as used in the claims. A new paragraph has been added, after Paragraph [0021] setting forth the relationship between the terms used in the claims and those shown in the drawings. No new matter has been added, since the relationships were clearly set out in the original claims.
5. Claims 1-8 and 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for failing to comply with the written description requirement, i.e., the claims contain subject matter which is not properly described in the Specification. Insofar as this rejection might be applied to the application as amended, it is respectfully traversed.

This rejection is directly related to the objection addressed above in paragraph 4. Applicant has amended the Specification to overcome this rejection, and the noted objection, and believes that it is now overcome. In any event, Applicant would like to point out that the selection of terminology belongs to him, so long as the terminology is not illogical or directly contrary to the ordinary



Creation date: 09-22-2004
Indexing Officer: JPARKER - JOYCE PARKER
Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing
Dossier: 10053841

Legal Date: 02-23-2004

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	SRNT	9
2	SRNT	7
3	SRNT	2

Total number of pages: 18

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on